

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 25 were pending in the present application. Claims 1 – 4, 9 – 20, 24, and 25 have been amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Independent claims 1, 9, 17, and 25 have been amended. Support for the amendments may be found at least at page 10, lines 13 – 14 (section [0026]) and page 14, line 23 – page 15, line 3 (section [0042]) of Applicant's specification.

Claims 9 – 16 have been amended to recite, in pertinent part, a "computer-readable storage medium." Support for the amendments may be found at least at page 15, lines 5 – 11 (section [0043]) of Applicant's specification.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1 – 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Risch (U.S. Pat. No. 5,471,629). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 (as amended) recites:

1. A method for tuning database objects, the method comprising:
collecting and storing performance data for a plurality of database objects in a database server computer system, wherein each of the plurality of database objects comprises an aggregation of stored data;
detecting a performance problem in the database server computer system;
identifying a problematic database object of the plurality of database objects using the performance data for the plurality of database objects, wherein the problematic database object is related to the performance problem; and
tuning the problematic database object to improve performance of access to the stored data in the database server computer system.

Regarding claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Risch fails to teach or suggest a method comprising “tuning the problematic database object to improve performance of access to the stored data in the database server computer system” as recited in claim 1 (as amended). Risch discloses a method for monitoring database objects such that clients are notified of database changes at an optimal rate. The database monitor disclosed by Risch may be configured using any of four tuning parameters (see, e.g., col. 10, lines 58 – 62). It is therefore the monitor itself in Risch that is tuned, not any of the database objects monitored by the monitor. Furthermore, the monitor is tuned for optimal notification of the monitor’s clients (see, e.g., col. 7, lines 15 – 21), not “to improve performance of access to the stored data in the database server computer system.”

Applicant reminds the Examiner that anticipation requires the presence of each and every limitation of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim, in a single prior art reference. M.P.E.P 2131; *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claims. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). As discussed above, Risch fails to disclose a method comprising “tuning the problematic database object to improve performance of access to the stored data in the database server computer system.” Therefore, Risch cannot be said to anticipate claim 1.

Thus, for at least the reasons above, the rejection of claim 1 is not supported by the cited art, and removal thereof is respectfully requested. Because independent claims 9, 17, and 25 recite limitations similar to those of claim 1, these claims are also believed to patentably distinguish over Risch. Applicant also asserts that numerous other ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. However, since the rejection has been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5760-14700/BNK.

Respectfully submitted,



B. Noël Kivlin
Reg. No. 33,929
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800
Date: June 22, 2006